DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 055 CG 024 071

AUTHOR Free, Marvin D., Jr.
TITLE Another Look at the Relationship between the Broken Home and Juvenile Delinquency.
PUB DATE Aug 91
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems (Cincinnati, OH, August 21-23, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Delinquency; Etiology; *Family Structure; Higher Education; *One Parent Family; Predictor Variables; Theories; Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

Inadequate samples, methodological deficiencies, and inadequate measures of delinquency and family structure have contributed to the confusion regarding the relationship between the broken home and delinquency. This investigation, seeking to overcome many of the deficiencies of earlier research, used a large, geographically diverse sample, a 70-item self-reported delinquency measure, and familial and nonfamilial variables to examine the broken home/delinquency relationship. The confounding of results that occurs when different types of broken homes are collapsed into a composite measure was eliminated by restricting the broken home variable to one-parent variables. Subjects (N=1,011) were college students between the ages of 17 to 22 years old. Sixteen of the 70 categories in the delinquency measure were found to be significantly related to family structure. These included such items as having broken into a locked car, hit a teacher, used cocaine, and stayed away from school when parents thought the student was there. While these findings suggest that family structure adds little to the understanding of delinquency, the broken home may yet prove to be an important variable in the formation of delinquency. It remains to be seen what influence stepfamilies, adoptive families, and foster homes have on the evolution of delinquent behavior. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED343055

ANOTHER LOOK AT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BROKEN HOME AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Marvin D. Free, Jr.

Assistant Professor of Sociology

University of Wisconsin Center - Marathon County

518 South 7th Avenue

Wausau, WI 54401

(715) 845-9602 X269

Society for the Study of Social Problems

1991 Annual Meeting

Cincinnati, Ohio

August 21-23, 1991

CG024071

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marvin D. Free, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Inadequate samples, methodological deficiencies, and inadequate measures of delinquency and family structure have contributed to the confusion regarding the relationship between the broken home and delinquency. This investigation, seeking to overcome many of the deficiencies of earlier research, uses a large, geographically diverse sample, a seventy-item self-reported delinquency measure, and familial and nonfamilial variables to examine the broken home/delinquency relationship. The confounding of results that occurs when different types of broken homes are collapsed into a composite measure is eliminated by restricting the broken home variable to one-parent families.

This study raises two important questions: (1) What types of offenses are related to family structure? and (2) What is the maximum amount of variance in delinquency that can be explained by family structure? With reference to the first issue, the results suggest that family structure affects a wide array of offenses. Sixteen of the seventy categories in the delinquency measure are significantly ($p<.05$) related to the broken home. Both minor and serious offenses are affected by family structure. These sixteen offenses are then reexamined using stepwise multiple regression. A model comprised of variables from containment theory and social bond theory is developed and tested. Also included in the model are family structure and demographic variables. The analysis indicates that even in a situation that should maximize the impact of the broken home on delinquency, only 2.2 percent of the variance is explained.

ANOTHER LOOK AT THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE BROKEN HOME AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Interest in the relationship of the broken home to delinquency can be traced back to the inauguration of the juvenile court system in the United States around the turn of the century (Monahan, 1957). Yet despite the wealth of information accumulated since this time, our understanding of the association between these variables remains vague (Wells and Rankin, 1985). A number of reasons can be attributed to this including inadequate samples, methodological deficiencies, and inadequate measures of delinquency and family structure.[1]

Under the rubric of sampling inadequacies would fall the use of small, nonrepresentative samples and the use of known delinquents. Researchers have been particularly quick to point out that the use of official delinquents can be misleading as the findings may be a function of the practices and biases of social control agencies rather than involvement in delinquent activities (Wilkinson, 1974; Rankin, 1983; Farnworth, 1984). The apparent "cure" for this problem is to utilize self-reported delinquent behavior, though this delinquency measure has been criticized for overemphasizing minor offenses (Hindelang et al., 1979; Ageton, 1983).

Methodological deficiencies often arise when the small number of adolescents from nonintact homes precludes the use of multivariate statistical techniques. When this situation occurs the investigator typically employs bivariate measures to analyze the relationships. Further complicating this issue is the common problem of limiting the analysis to a small number of variables. A related issue involves the failure of many researchers to include nonfamilial variables in their investigations.

According to Johnstone (1980, p. 91) this oversight is unfortunate because "It is likely...that family systems are strongly influenced by environmental circumstances, and that the family itself may have a different relationship to delinquency in different types of social environments."

Inadequate measures of delinquency and family structure have also contributed to our confusion. In addition to the previously mentioned problem of using official records as an indicator of delinquency, some researchers have investigated the relationship of the broken home to general delinquency. However, the concept "delinquency" is too broad to be meaningful as nonintact homes may be related to one type of delinquency but not another (Wells and Rankin, 1986). Moreover, the broken home variable has been used to refer to a number of different family arrangements including mother-absent families, father-absent families, stepfamilies, adoptive families, and foster homes. Since it is plausible that different types of broken homes could affect children in different ways, the results of these discrete studies are frequently incomparable.

In order to overcome the ambiguities of earlier research, this study seeks to accomplish two objectives. First, since it has been suggested that the broken home may be related to certain types of delinquent conduct but not others, this investigation explores the relationship between family structure and specific types of delinquent behavior. The second objective is aimed at ascertaining the maximum amount of variance in the dependent variable that can be explained by family structure by focusing on those offenses associated with nonintact homes. A determination of the actual contribution of family structure to delinquency is needed because the typically weak association reported by many contemporary researchers may

actually be a reflection of the selection of delinquent offenses that are largely unaffected by family structure.

This study attempts to overcome many of the deficiencies of previous investigations in a number of ways. First, this research analyzes data from a large, geographically diverse sample of youths from intact and nonintact families. Second, a seventy-item self-reported delinquency measure containing minor and serious offenses is utilized in order to avert the potential problem of differential law enforcement leveled against studies using official delinquents. As another criticism of earlier research is that the studies often relied exclusively on bivariate statistics, this analysis utilizes both bivariate and multivariate statistics. Furthermore, familial and nonfamilial variables are examined in the model.

Two additional criticisms of the extant literature are its use of a general delinquency measure and a confounding of results due to the combining of various types of nonintact homes into a single category. Several steps are taken to remedy these weaknesses. To improve our understanding of the relationship between the broken home and delinquency, separate analyses of six indexes of delinquency as well as each of the seventy individual variables are conducted. The second problem is addressed by limiting the investigation to a comparison of youths from intact families to youths from one-parent families.

The Study

Questionnaires were administered to students at two universities located in geographically diverse areas. One of the universities is a medium-size, private university in the southwest that is largely composed of

middle and upper-middle class students. In contrast, the other university is a freshman-sophomore level transfer institution affiliated with a major state university in the midwest. Students attending this institution come predominantly from working class families. All of the respondents were enrolled in sociology classes during either the spring or fall semesters of 1988. Although it could be argued that the self-selection process of college attendance would preclude the inclusion of the more delinquent population, it should be noted that each of the seventy measures of delinquency was answered in the affirmative by one or more respondents.

The original sample contained 1,090 respondents. As a result of potential problems with recall, a decision was made to restrict the sample to traditional college-age students. In addition to deleting all respondents over the age of twenty-two years, two additional respondents living in families where both parents were absent were eliminated. This brought the final sample to 1,011 respondents (939 from intact families and 72 from one-parent families). The ages ranged from 17 to 22 years old, with 90.6 percent of the sample under 21 years of age. Females outnumbered males in this study (59.8 percent versus 40.2 percent), mirroring a trend of the college population in general. Whites comprised 96.1 percent of the final sample.

To commence the investigation statistical tests were run to ascertain the relationship between family structure and delinquency. As employed in this study, family structure is a dichotomous variable (intact/broken) that restricts broken homes to one-parent families. Delinquency is measured by yes/no responses to seventy items comprising six indexes (overall delinquency, official contact, serious crime, delinquency, drug, and

school/family offenses). Questions contained in the delinquency measure represent a slightly modified version of a self-report instrument used by Hindelang et al. (1981). Table 1 reports the Cronbach's alpha for each of the indexes. T tests were run to determine if family structure is significantly related to any of the indexes. Next, chi-square statistics were calculated for family structure and each of the individual measures of delinquency. A new delinquency index was then created using only the statistically significant offenses for the purpose of testing the multivariate model.

Table 1 about here

Because the objective of the multivariate model is to ascertain the optimum amount of variance in the delinquency measure explained by family structure, the dependent variable contains only those delinquency measures previously found to be significantly related to the broken home (see Table 2). Selection of independent variables was guided by the social control theories of Reckless (1967) and Hirschi (1969). Moreover, relevant demographic variables are included in the model.

Table 2 about here

According to containment theory, inner and outer containment operate as buffers against delinquency (Reckless, 1967). Inner containment refers to the ability of the individual to control himself/herself and to follow society's norms. It is therefore necessary for the individual to

internalize the values, norms, morals, and ethics of his/her society. As religion is a major socializing agent, the relatively neglected variable of religiosity is included in the model.[2] Although there is a paucity of research, support can be found for the hypothesis that there is an inverse relationship between religiosity and delinquency (Rhodes and Reiss, 1970; Higgins and Albrecht, 1977; Elifson et al., 1983). Nine items in the questionnaire are employed to measure religiosity. The questions have been previously used by Stark and Glock (1968) to assess religiosity in the United States. As indicated in Table 1, the index of religiosity has a Cronbach's alpha of .8886.

Outer containment alludes to the ability of societal groups to inhibit the deviant tendencies of individuals. For young people the family is a primary agent of social control. As such it is important to include some measure of the amount of supervision that the child receives. An indirect measure that has been utilized by some investigators is the employment status of the mother (see Hirschi, 1969). It is typically assumed that if the mother is employed outside the home, she has less time available to closely supervise the child than if she is unemployed. Support for this proposition comes from Nye (1958) and Hirschi (1969) who found that delinquency increased when the mother worked. More recent studies by Wilson (1980) and Cernkovich and Giordano (1987), utilizing multiple measures of parental supervision, support the earlier findings. Maternal employment status is measured in this investigation with a single question.[3]

Two additional independent variables were selected on the basis of their relevance to social control theory. Attachment to school and involvement in conventional activities have been regarded in social control

theory as potential buffers against delinquency (Hirschi, 1969).[4] Two questions involving attachment to high school are included in the questionnaire. The first item asks the respondent if he/she liked or disliked high school while the second item inquires as to whether or not the respondent cared what the high school teachers thought of him/her. Table 1 reveals the Cronbach's alpha for this index to be .4871. Hirschi (1969), utilizing the same questions, found that these two measures were strongly related to self-reported and official delinquency. His findings suggest that a weak attachment to school is associated with greater involvement in delinquent activities. More recent investigations by Hindelang (1973) and Wiatrowski et al. (1981) corroborate Hirschi's findings.

Additionally, involvement in conventional activities has been found to be inversely related to delinquency (Hirschi, 1969; Hindelang, 1973; Wiatrowski, 1981). Three items are used to measure an individual's involvement in conventional activities. Because the questions were largely unrelated to one another, it was decided that each should constitute a separate variable. The first of these variables is the amount of time spent on homework during high school. Hirschi (1969) and Hindelang (1973) report a negative association between time spent on homework and delinquency. Another measure of involvement in conventional activities is high school employment status. While Hirschi's (1969) analysis failed to disclose a negative relationship between work and delinquency, other investigators have observed inverse relationships (Thornberry and Christenson, 1984; Good et al., 1986; Allan and Steffensmeier, 1989).[5] And finally, involvement in high school extra-curricular activities is tapped as a third measure of involvement in conventional activities. An inverse relationship between

this variable and delinquency has been observed by Hindelang (1973).

Two demographic variables are included in the model. The first of these is gender, a variable that is frequently associated with delinquency. Whether utilizing official measures of delinquency (LeFlore, 1988) or unofficial measures of delinquency (Gold, 1970; Hindelang, 1971; Jensen and Eve, 1976; Canter, 1982), researchers have typically observed that males are more delinquent than females. Another variable that tends to be correlated with delinquency is social class (Johnstone, 1978; Rosen, 1985), though the relationship appears to be stronger in those studies employing official delinquency measures (Braithwaite, 1981). Because income and father's occupation are unavailable in the sample examined here, father's educational attainment is used as an indicator of social class.

Findings and Discussion

Table 3 enumerates the results of the t tests used to ascertain which broad categories of delinquency are associated with family structure. As indicated by this table, three indexes are significantly related to the broken home. The first of these is the official contact index ($p=.04$). Two possible explanations for this finding can be proffered. One possibility is that the relationship reflects the greater involvement in major offenses by youths from nonintact homes. An alternative explanation -- and one that is found in much of the literature -- is that the relationship is the result of selective enforcement of the law by agents of social control. In this investigation the former explanation appears to be the more tenable one given that the broken home is significantly ($p=.02$) related to the serious crime index but not the delinquency index ($p=.23$) which contains the less

serious offenses. Furthermore, respondents from nonintact homes are disproportionately more delinquent in fifty-three of the seventy offenses examined. And finally, as expected, the broken home is also significantly ($p=.04$) related to the school and family offenses index.

Table 3 about here

The diversity of the offenses related to family structure is revealed in Table 2. Sixteen of the items in the overall delinquency index are significantly ($p<.05$) associated with the broken home. A perusal of Table 2 discloses that only one of the five items in the official contact index is related to family structure. In other words, respondents from nonintact homes are <u>not</u> significantly more likely than respondents from intact homes to have been questioned by the police, put on probation, sentenced to a reformatory or training school, or caught shoplifting. These findings further corroborate the earlier statement that selective law enforcement does not appear to be operating here.

Of the twenty-four offenses listed in the serious crime index, family structure is significantly related to nine. Included in these nine offenses are property crimes and crimes against the person. Some of the more commonly analyzed offenses are not related to family structure, however. Researchers frequently include the categories of theft between ten and fifty dollars and theft over fifty dollars. Yet neither offense is related to the broken home. Thus, it would seem that some investigators have focused on crimes that are not influenced by family structure.

Only two of the twenty-two items from the delinquency index are

correlated with family structure. Since this index consists of the less serious offenses (e.g., theft under two dollars, letting air out of tires, firing a BB gun at someone, picking a fight, vandalism, etc.), it appears that the broken home plays little role in the development of minor offenses.

While the broken home is not significantly related to the drug index, three of the drug offenses are significantly related to family structure. Selling illicit drugs, taking nonprescription "downers" or "uppers", and using cocaine are more common among respondents from nonintact homes than intact homes. On the other hand, there are no differences between youths from broken homes and youths from intact homes for the following offenses: drinking alcoholic beverages while under the legal age, smoking marijuana, going to school drunk or high, driving a car while drunk or high, or using other drugs such as angel dust, LSD, mescaline, or heroin. The weak relationship between the broken home and drug use often cited in research may therefore be due to the inclusion of drugs (particularly alcohol and marijuana) not associated with family structure.

The school and family offenses index is composed of seven items. Contrary to expectations, only one item is significantly related to family structure with truancy being more common among respondents from nonintact homes. Nonetheless, respondents from broken homes are more likely than respondents from intact homes to report greater involvement in all seven offenses. Moreover, it will be recalled that the school and family offenses index is significantly related to family structure.

In order to evaluate the effect of the broken home on delinquency under optimum conditions, the sixteen items significantly related to family structure were combined into a new index of delinquency (Cronbach's

alpha=.7525). A model incorporating the nine independent variables discussed in the preceding section and the new delinquency index was then tested. Forward stepwise multiple regression was employed in the analysis. In stepwise multiple regression a variable is added or deleted from the model depending upon its contribution to error variance reduction; therefore, some of the variables initially examined do not appear in the final model. The correlation matrix used in this procedure is displayed in Table 4, while Table 5 summarizes the results of this analysis.

Table 4 about here

Table 5 about here

As revealed in Table 4 there are a number of significant zero-order correlations. The results generally confirm the social control theories of Reckless and Hirschi. For example, religiosity, attachment to school, time spent on homework, and participation in extra-curricular activities are inversely related to delinquency. Therefore, young people who are more religious, have stronger attachments to school, devote more time to homework, and are more involved in extra-curricular activities are less likely than others to be delinquent. Additionally, as expected, time spent on homework and participation in extra-curricular activities are positively related to attachment to school. The data further suggest that individuals who spend more time on homework are more involved in extra-curricular activities. Moreover, religiosity appears to be positively associated with

other aspects of conforming behavior such as attachment to school and time spent on homework.

Somewhat surprising is the finding that high school employment is positively related to delinquent behavior. However, an explanation can be found by analyzing the relationships between high school employment and various components of the social bond. As high school employment is negatively related to attachment to school, time spent on homework, and participation in extra-curricular activities, it appears that individuals who work during high school have weaker social bonds than individuals who do not work. Furthermore, although Gottfredson (1985) found that employment did not affect these variables, these results do corroborate the earlier findings by Steinberg et al. (1982) who report that the more time high school students spend working, the less they enjoy school and the less time they spend on homework. It should also be noted that Hirschi (1969, pp. 188-189) observed a slight positive relationship between working and self-reported delinquency. Although at first glance this seems to contradict the basic premise of social bond theory, Hirschi (1983) suggests otherwise. According to Hirschi employment may reduce the extent to which young people are dependent on their parents, thereby diminishing the ability of parents to control the behavior of their children. Consequently, a positive relationship between employment and delinquency is consistent with social bond theory.

Table 4 additionally discloses that delinquency is positively related to family structure and gender indicating that delinquency is more common among youths from broken homes than intact ones and males are more delinquent than females. Both of these findings are in the predicted direction. The

greater involvement of males in delinquency can be attributed to their weaker bonds to society. When compared to females, males are less religious, have weaker attachments to school, spend less time on homework, and participate in fewer extra-curricular activities.

When the impact of the broken home on delinquency is examined using stepwise multiple regression some interesting findings emerge. As indicated in Table 5, even under optimum conditions that should maximize the effect of the broken home on delinquency, family structure explains only 2.2 percent of the variance in the dependent variable. In contrast, family structure explains a paltry .4 percent of the variance in the official contact index, .7 percent of the variance in the serious crime index, and is not included among the variables in the stepwise multiple regression models of the remaining indexes (not reported). Of the seven statistically significant variables found in the model represented in Table 5, family structure is ranked fourth. Religiosity (9.4 percent), time spent on homework (6.5 percent), and gender (4.3 percent) each explains more of the variance in delinquency than does family structure. Overall, then, family structure as operationalized in this investigation accounts for little of the variance in delinquency.

Summary and Conclusions

While researchers have long been concerned with the relationship of the broken home on delinquency, methodological deficiencies, inadequate samples, and inadequate measures of delinquency and family structure have precluded a better understanding of the nature of this association. This investigation attempted to overcome many of the problems of earlier studies by utilizing a

large, geographically diverse sample, a seventy-item self-reported delinquency measure, familial and nonfamilial variables, and multivariate statistics. Further, the broken home variable was restricted to one-parent families thereby eliminating the confounding of the findings that results from the aggregating of different types of broken homes into a single category.

When the seventy-item delinquency index is broken down into five separate indexes plus an overall delinquency index, it becomes apparent that family structure is not uniformly related to the various offenses. Using the .05 level of significance, one finds that family structure is not significantly related to the overall delinquency index, delinquency index, or drug index. There are, however, significant relationships between family structure and the official contact index, serious crime index, and school and family offenses index.

An analysis of each of the seventy items from the overall delinquency index discloses that sixteen items are significantly ($p<.05$) related to family structure. The offenses are not restricted to the less serious offenses as suggested by many researchers. Instead, offenses are included from all five indexes. Of special interest is the relationship between family structure and being detained by the police or court. Although youths from nonintact homes are more likely than youths from intact homes to be detained, there is no indication that this is the result of differential law enforcement given the serious nature of many of the offenses committed by young people from nonintact homes. It is possible, though, that differential law enforcement might have been detected had the sample contained a larger number of minorities.

The multivariate model was comprised of variables from containment theory and social bond theory. Family structure and demographic variables were also incorporated into the model. Stepwise multiple regression was employed in the analysis. The results indicate that even in a situation that should maximize the impact of the broken home on delinquency, family structure has little effect on delinquency when the influence of other variables is controlled.

While these findings suggest that family structure adds little to our understanding of delinquency, the broken home may yet prove to be an important variable in the formation of delinquency. A paucity of minorities in the sample made it impossible to investigate if differential effects based on ethnicity were present. Given the limited number of youths from nonintact homes it was also impossible to determine if gender differences existed. Furthermore, this cross-sectional study needs to be corroborated by longitudinal investigations using nationally representative samples. In addition, it must be remembered that this research was confined to one type of broken home -- one-parent families. It remains to be seen what influence stepfamilies, adoptive families, and foster homes have on the evolution of delinquent behavior.

NOTES

1. Many investigators have commented on the weaknesses inherent in much of the research. For a more complete discussion of these issues the reader should refer to Wilkinson (1974), Johnstone (1980), Rankin (1983), and Wells and Rankin (1986).

2. The need to include some measure of religiosity in social control models of delinquency has been recognized by Krohn and Massey (1980, p. 542) in their evaluation of Hirschi's (1969) social bond theory.

3. Mother's employment was broken down initially into four categories: (1) worked full-time, (2) worked part-time, (3) worked off-and-on, and (4) did not work. Responses two and three were later collapsed into a single category.

4. Although admittedly other elements of the social bond could have been examined in this investigation, Krohn and Massey (1980) have observed that, of the social bonds, commitment (a combination of attachment to school and involvement in conventional activities) has the strongest effect on delinquency and illicit drug use.

5. This relationship may be an artifact of the way in which delinquency is measured. All three of the previously cited studies utilized official measures of delinquency. When self-reported measures of delinquency have been used, employment and delinquency are largely unrelated (see Shannon, 1982; Gottfredson, 1985).

REFERENCES

Ageton, Suzanne S. 1983. "The Dynamics of Female Delinquency, 1976-1980." Criminology 21:555-584.

Allan, Emilie A. and Darrell J. Steffensmeier. 1989. "Youth, Underemployment, and Property Crime: Differential Effects of Job Availability and Job Quality on Juvenile and Young Adult Arrest Rates." American Sociological Review 54:107-123.

Braithwaite, John. 1981. "The Myth of Social Class and Criminality Reconsidered." American Sociological Review 46:36-57.

Canter, Rachelle J. 1982. "Family Correlates of Male and Female Delinquency. Criminology 20:149-167.

Cernkovich, Stephen A. and Peggy C. Giordano. 1987. "Family Relationships and Delinquency." Criminology 25:295-321.

Elifson, Kirk W., David M. Petersen, and C. Kirk Hadaway. 1983. "Religiosity and Delinquency: A Contextual Analysis." Criminology 21:505-527.

Farnworth, Margaret. 1984. "Family Structure, Family Attributes, and Delinquency in a Sample of Low-Income, Minority Males and Females. Journal of Youth and Adolescence 13:349-364.

Gold, Martin. 1970. Delinquent Behavior in an American City. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole.

Good, David H., Maureen A. Pirog-Good, and Robin C. Sickles. 1986. "An Analysis of Youth Crime and Employment Patterns." Journal of Quantitative Criminology 2:219-236.

Gottfredson, Denise C. 1985. "Youth Employment, Crime, and Schooling: A Longitudinal Study of a National Sample." Developmental Psychology 21:419-432.

Higgins, Paul C. and Gary L. Albrecht. 1977. "Hellfire and Delinquency Revisited." Social Forces 55:952-958.

Hindelang, Michael J. 1971. "Age, Sex, and the Versatility of Delinquent Involvements." Social Problems 18:522-535.

_____. 1973. "Causes of Delinquency: A Partial Replication and Extension." Social Problems 20:471-487.

Hindelang, Michael J., Travis Hirschi, and Joseph G. Weis. 1979. "Correlates of Delinquency: The Illusion of Discrepancy Between Self-Report and Official Measures." American Sociological Review 44:995-1014.

_____. 1981. Measuring Delinquency. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

Hirschi, Travis. 1969. Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.

_____. 1983. "Crime and the Family." Pp. 53-63 in Crime and Public Policy, edited by James Q. Wilson. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies.

Jensen, Gary J. and Raymond Eve. 1976. "Sex Differences in Delinquency: An Examination of Popular Sociological Explanations." Criminology 13:427-448.

Johnstone, John W. C. 1978. "Juvenile Delinquency and the Family: A Contextual Interpretation." Youth and Society 9:299-313.

_____. 1980. "Delinquency and the Changing American Family." Pp. 83-97 in Critical Issues in Juvenile Delinquency, edited by David Shichor and Delos H. Kelly. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Krohn, Marvin D. and James L. Massey. 1980. "Social Control and Delinquent Behavior: An Examination of the Elements of the Social Bond." The Sociological Quarterly 21:529-544.

LeFlore, Larry. 1988. "Delinquent Youths and Family." Adolescence 23:629-642.

Monahan, Thomas P. 1957. "Family Status and the Delinquent Child: A Reappraisal and Some New Findings." Social Forces 35:250-258.

Nye, F. Ivan. 1958. Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: John Wiley.

Rankin, Joseph H. 1983. "The Family Context of Delinquency." Social Problems 30:466-479.

Reckless, Walter C. 1967. The Crime Problem (4th edition). New York: Meredith Publishing Company.

Rhodes, Albert L. and Albert J. Reiss, Jr. 1970. "The 'Religious Factor' and Delinquent Behavior." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 7:83-98.

Rosen, Lawrence. 1985. "Family and Delinquency: Structure or Function?" Criminology 23:553-573.

Shannon, L. W. 1982. Assessing the Relationship of Adult Criminal Careers to Juvenile Careers. Washington D.C.: U. S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Stark, Rodney and Charles Y. Glock. 1968. American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Steinberg, L.D., E. Greenberger, L. Garduque, M. Ruggiero, and A. Vaux. 1982. "Effects of Working on Adolescent Development." Developmental Psychology 18:385-395.

Thornberry, Terence P. and R. L. Christenson. 1984. "Unemployment and Criminal Involvement: An Investigation of Reciprocal Causal Structures." American Sociological Review 49:398-411.

Wells, L. Edward and Joseph H. Rankin. 1985. "Broken Homes and Juvenile Delinquency: An Empirical Review." Criminal Justice Abstracts 17:249-272.

_____. 1986. "The Broken Homes Model of Delinquency: Analytic Issues." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 23:68-93.

Wiatrowski, Michael D., David B. Griswold, and Mary K. Roberts. 1981. "Social Control Theory and Delinquency." American Sociological Review 46:525-541.

Wilkinson, Karen. 1974. "The Broken Family and Juvenile Delinquency: Scientific Explanation or Ideology?" Social Problems 21:726-739.

Wilson, Harriett. 1980. "Parental Supervision: A Neglected Aspect of Delinquency." The British Journal of Criminology 20:203-235.

TABLE 1

RELIABILITY ASSESSMENT OF MULTIPLE MEASUREMENT VARIABLES

Variable Name	Number of Items	Cronbach's alpha
religiosity	9	.8886
attachment to school	2	.4871
overall delinquency index	70	.9134
official contact index	5	.5397
serious crime index	24	.7068
delinquency index	22	.8317
drug index	12	.8300
school/family offenses index	7	.6645

TABLE 2

DELINQUENCY MEASURES SIGNIFICANTLY RELATED TO FAMILY STRUCTURE*

Item	Index
"Been held by the police or court until you could be released into the custody of your parents or guardians"	Official Contact Index
"Sold something you had stolen yourself"	Serious Crime Index
"Broken into a locked car (other than your own) to get something from it"	Serious Crime Index
"Taken hubcaps, wheels, the battery, or some other expensive part of a car without the owner's permission"	Serious Crime Index
"Taken gasoline from a car without the owner's permission"	Serious Crime Index
"Carried a razor, switchblade, or gun with the intention of using it in a fight"	Serious Crime Index

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

Item	Index
"Beat somebody up so badly they probably needed a doctor"	Serious Crime Index
"Taken a car belonging to someone you didn't know for a ride without the owner's permission"	Serious Crime Index
"Taken a tape deck or a CB radio from a car"	Serious Crime Index
"Hit a teacher or some other school official"	Serious Crime Index
"Taken little things (worth less than $2) from a store without paying for them"	Delinquency Index
"Driven away from the scene of an accident that you were involved in without identifying yourself"	Delinquency Index

TABLE 2 CONTINUED

Item	Index
"Sold illegal drugs such as heroin, marijuana, LSD, or cocaine"	Drug Index
"Taken barbiturates (downers) or methedrine (speed or other uppers) without a prescription"	Drug Index
"Used cocaine"	Drug Index
"Stayed away from school when your parents thought you were there"	School/Family Offenses Index

* All of the reported relationships are significant at the .05 level or better.

TABLE 3

RELATIONSHIP OF FAMILY STRUCTURE TO DELINQUENCY INDEXES

Delinquency Index	Significance Level
Overall Delinquency Index	.06
Official Contact Index	.04
Serious Crime Index	.02
Delinquency Index	.23
Drug Index	.19
School/Family Offenses Index	.04

TABLE 4

ZERO-ORDER CORRELATION MATRIX OF THE INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES

	X^1	X^2	X^3	X^4	X^5	X^6	X^7	X^8	X^9	X^{10}
X^1	____									
X^2	-.0910 (.0041)	____								
X^3	.1324 (.0000)	-.1161 (.0003)	____							
X^4	-.0484 (.1239)	.2780 (.0000)	.0493 (.1185)	____						
X^5	-.0174 (.5807)	.1271 (.0001)	.0136 (.6680)	.2147 (.0000)	____					
X^6	.0634 (.0439)	-.1024 (.0013)	.1276 (.0001)	-.0817 (.0095)	-.1089 (.0006)	____				
X^7	-.0384 (.2235)	.2881 (.0000)	.0242 (.4446)	.3273 (.0000)	.1038 (.0010)	-.1535 (.0000)	____			
X^8	.0556 (.0773)	-.1263 (.0001)	.0482 (.1275)	-.1368 (.0000)	-.2098 (.0000)	.0072 (.8203)	-.1372 (.0000)	____		
X^9	-.1104 (.0005)	.3255 (.0000)	-.1060 (.0008)	.0992 (.0016)	.0164 (.6035)	-.1153 (.0003)	.2129 (.0000)	-.0222 (.4812)	____	
X^{10}	.1755 (.0000)	-.3000 (.0000)	.0194 (.5390)	-.2441 (.0000)	-.2952 (.0000)	.1289 (.0000)	-.1271 (.0001)	.2840 (.0000)	-.0380 (.2285)	____

X^1 = Family Structure

X^2 = Religiosity

X^3 = Maternal Employment

X^4 = Attachment to School

X^5 = Time Spent on Homework

X^6 = High School Job

X^7 = Extra-Curricular Activities

X^8 = Gender

X^9 = Social Class

X^{10} = 16-Item Delinquency Index

P-values appear in parentheses..

TABLE 5

RESULTS OF THE STEPWISE MULTIPLE REGRESSION MODEL

Step	Variable Entered	R^2	Cumulative R^2	F	P
1	Religiosity	.0942	.0942	120.548	.0000
2	Homework	.0649	.1591	82.985	.0000
3	Gender	.0430	.2021	55.045	.0000
4	Family Structure	.0224	.2245	28.636	.0000
5	Attachment to School	.0098	.2342	12.519	.0004
6	High School Job	.0052	.2395	6.700	.0098
7	Social Class	.0056	.2451	7.162	.0076